

German Newspaper Story Links Nazis Here With Hitler

Evidence that Nazis in Milwaukee are closely linked with the Hitler government was disclosed today in copies of newspapers received here from Germany.

This new revelation came as anti-Fascists prepared to picket the German-American home in Kenosha at which the Deutsch-Amerikanische Volksbund, Nazi organization, planned to hold a self-styled "German Day" celebration on Sunday.

Meanwhile protests against activities of the Nazis in Wisconsin mounted. Attacks came from the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation of Milwaukee county, the Committee Against Nazi Activities in Wisconsin, and the Communist party state committee.

In Hanover Paper

The tie-up between Nazis here and Hitlerites in Germany was divulged in a leading Nazi daily newspaper of Hanover, Germany, dated Aug. 3, 1936.

An interview carried in the Hanover paper told of an "enthusiastic reception" given to a delegation of members of the Deutsch-Amerikanische Volksbund, headed by "Gauleiter" George Froboese of Milwaukee.

Froboese is midwest leader of the Volksbund. He has been spokesman of the Nazis in their unsuccessful effort to win use of a Kenosha municipal park for their Sunday rally.

Promise of Fight

Minister of State Spangenhauer greeted the delegation and told them "the new Germany is filled with the spirit of peace" and the visitors "could take this message

back to the United States," the Hanover paper reported.

Its account continued:

"On behalf of the visitors, 'Gauleiter' Froboese replied that German-Americans had never believed the press lies about Germany and now the visitors could see for themselves that all the reports of the anti-Nazis were lies. They would return to America with the determination to fight for German culture in America with new strength."

Froboese's Big Moment

The paper then related Froboese's description of an audience he had with Hitler in the following words:

"Froboese declared his and his comrades' most delectable experience had been their reception by Adolf Hitler. 'We feel like the happiest men in the world for having shaken hands with the Fuehrer,' Froboese said.

"Froboese assured his audience that the American people felt differently about German people than the American press. He closed his speech with a triple 'Victory and Heil' for the new Germany and his adopted country, America."

World Call Sounded

A later story in the Hanover paper told of Froboese and the other American Nazis being guests at a dinner in the Hanover opera house, at which governmental leaders were hosts. In a speech at the dinner, Froboese was quoted as saying "only a strong fatherland would make it possible for Germans in foreign countries to get the necessary moral support."

A report from the Hanover paper turned to Page Six, Column Four.

NAZI LEAGUE HERE LINKED WITH HITLER

Continued From Page One

per of Feb. 27, 1937, told of a speech by Hitler's newly appointed chief of foreign organizations, one Bohle, who called upon Germans throughout the world to "remember their duty to co-operate in this grand ideal of a world community of Nazis with Germany."

Milwaukee anti-Nazi Germans cited this Bohle statement as further proof that Nazi organizations everywhere are tightly connected with the Hitler government itself in Germany.

The Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, in its statement denouncing Nazism, declared:

"It is obvious that in spite of general opposition, the Wisconsin Nazis will hold their conclave in Kenosha. The federation of Milwaukee is not particularly concerned with where this meeting is held, whether it is in a public place or in a private park.

"What we are concerned with is the attempt at infusing into the free air of Wisconsin a doctrine that seeks to destroy every semblance of liberty and democracy.

"The federation is wholeheartedly and irrevocably opposed to everything for which Nazis and Nazism stands. Nazism in Germany has meant the ruthless destruction of everything men the world over hold dear and indispensable to life, as free men in an enlightened civilization.

"We have not forgotten Nazi destruction of the trade union movement, Nazi repression of every liberal hope, Nazi destruction of scientific freedom, Nazi assault upon the church, both Catholic and Protestant, and Nazi senseless persecution of the minority Jewish race merely as a scapegoat for their vile offenses against civilization and humanity.

"Nazism to us is the anti-thesis of what liberty loving people in their struggle for a better life have always sought.

"Because of the self-expressed reputed strength of this Fascist movement it becomes important for every free man to be alert to the menace inherent in it.

"Leaders of local Nazism have publicly boasted that the purpose of the Kenosha meeting is to spread their propaganda in Wisconsin.

"We, therefore, call upon the citizens of our progressive state to be vigilant of their liberties; recognize the sinister, un-American movement of Nazism that seeks to destroy that for which builders of our country gave their lives. Every peace loving man and woman must join to combat these forces."

D

one
the
An
res
pre
let
fre
in
an

The resolution was signed by J. F. Friedrich, chairman, and George Hampel, secretary.

Action of the Kenosha city council in revoking the permit for the Nazi demonstration in a public park was hailed by the Communist party's state committee today as a "victory for the people of Kenosha and Wisconsin over the un-American, anti-labor agents of Hitler in our midst."

The committee's statement, issued through Ned Sparks, state secretary, and Fred Bassett Blair, state organizer, added that "we are particularly glad to see that the leaders of the veterans' organizations are finally stepping forward in their proper role as defenders of American democracy against the ideas of Nazi tyranny."

MR. BLAIR: In the first place, I haven't read Mao's statement. I read some comments in the paper about it. And I

really This is an interview of Mr. Fred B. Blair, Chairman of the Communist Party of Wisconsin, by David Thelen, on August 15, 1963.

MR. BLAIR: Wherever there are classes, you find a struggle, and there was plenty of evidence which can't be dismissed. People who are blind advisors, prejudiced to the color which they fancy to be scientific sometimes if they're well educated, but it's quite obvious that there are classes. There's the primary class, the working class, and the employing class and there are statistics and things on the number of man hours lost in strikes. This shows you this form of class struggle is taking place, have it all the time, and all one has to do is work in any enterprise to feel the class struggle going on every minute of the day. So as far as that goes, as a matter of fact, the southern Negro people today is one form in which the class struggle is taking the country. The hard part of it is the struggle for jobs, the fight for different places to work, all the other forms it takes, the morals, the judicial, legislative, they are all basically influenced by this problem of the economic need of the Negro people and the picture of our working people employed.

DAVID: Well, you were mentioning the, let's talk about the Negro question, the class struggling, Mao Tse-tung, the Vietnam thing, and you were mentioning upstairs that you felt that Soviet America was not as valid today, why do you, what is your ah--

MR. BLAIR: In the first place, I haven't read Mao's statement. I read some comments in the paper about it. And I really look forward to getting copies of it and get through reading it. Secondly, what I was referring to upstairs was a period in our party's life (about 1931 to 1935) when a whole series of pamphlets and articles were published built around this concept toward Soviet America which were put forward in the book by that name around 1932. In my opinion the whole concept of that book was more wrong, it was the type of mistake that the, it related in many ways to the type of mistake the Chinese are making today. It was a narrow approach. It was narrow in a sense that it didn't see other possibilities besides the transition from capitalism to socialism, besides a governmental form they would copy it after the Russians, the Soviet form, in English you understand. But it was also a dogmatic approach, it was just a copying of the experience. At that time there was only one socialist country, the Soviet Union. There was no real reason to feel that that's the way Socialism would develop in the United States. Our party has objected that whole approach, for some time, but I think they're still vicissitous of the thinking that went into that approach found among American Communists to a certain extent today, not in the policies and/or strategies worked out nationally or not even in the various districts, but in underlying approaches to our problems as they arrive. Behind the approach to Soviet America was the schematic approach to the class struggle in this country. It was all opposing to the working

class versus the capital class without distinguishing between the various sections within the capital class and the contradictions among them. It was an overlooking of the whole question of alliances with various classes. Oh, it was an attempt to skirt the whole problem of differences between the United States and the historical development in approaches of the people of old tradition and the differences between the United States and the other countries of the world. One by-product of this whole approach was the wrong attitude towards other movements which we might consider on the left and towards liberals. I think its very interesting that the same mistakes that we were making back 30 years ago and which we rejected not trying to eliminate at that time completely, are now being made by a whole school of history, the University of Wisconsin. I can't document this too closely but in conversations with individuals, professors, and others, there's rising a whole theory being developed in the number of books that the liberal capital class is the main instrument of monopoly to achieve the estimate of the country and so from this, they site the administrations of Theo. Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Truman and now Kennedy. And the contention is that there is no possibility of any Fascist regime arising in the United States and therefore no danger from the ulcerite, there's no ulcerite in existence in this country. Now this is in essence the same sort of error the American Communists are making in their approach toward Soviet America which we have rejected - the whole approach which we have rejected - and we think its rather an

interesting commentary that this type of error is popping up again extends from one center, that's the University of Wisconsin, but it extends to the publication and studies on the left. The echoes of this approach are found in Monthly Review and occasionally in the columns of the National Guardian Foundation for the science and society not to mention of course the connections that various people have that result in ideas popping up here in the nation as well. I think its a mistake in approach, that's the reason, why perhaps in this list some of the same notions are popping up in the approach of the Chinese Communists in world affairs, and world events.

DAVID: I'm not sure I follow this, what is the statement which you say the earlier line of Communist party of the professors of University . . . I'm not quite sure I understood it.

MR. BLAIR: The main instrument of monopoly is the liberals in politics, so called the liberal status, and sometimes in writing we speak of the effort. They assume the existence, they attempt to prove the existence of the whole current of liberalism which in their opinion served a face for reaction in this country. The Communists today see the main source of reaction in certain sections of the monopoly chapter, particularly those that are engaged in war production in the so-called war babies, missile plants and space, people go in space, think the oil trucks, the chemicals trucks, just deal in the munition and means of war to our expense. Between them and their grouping

in the Pentagon and in the government is being the main aspiring force of the ultralite in the politics. In our opinion this move is in the direction of Fascism.

Our liberal friends disagree with us, they feel that it's precisely the Kennedys, people like the Kennedys and the Roosevelts who strengthen monopoly capitalism the most and then bring reactionary measures into our life, under the guides of liberals. Therefore to them, the liberals are the main enemy. Kennedys have to be unmatched, the Roosevelts-they even include Truman in there for a while-they also invite the liberal workmen into Theodore Roosevelt, I think that was the essence of our error-that we didn't distinguish among grouping like this and another. We read about the tactics of Lenin and the Russian Revolution and from my own personal history-- I can't speak for anyone else. But you read his directing a main blow, for instance, at one period in the Revolution--at the Cadet Party, the Constitutional Democrat--right from the main blow of their tactics, because they were ones who were most likely to fool the people. Of course, they were out to overthrow czarism but in his opinion the Cadets had to be isolated from the master. At a later period, it was such parties as the Social Revolutionaries, similar to Menshevik being the master, influence had to be broken upon the masters. Now we looked at the Russian experiences and we didn't see the complexities of them because we weren't told to. We didn't understand what Lenin warranted the writings on this Communism. The way this isolation takes place is not through making them the main enemy and delivering your main

attack against them. The way they are isolated precisely by joining hands with the people of those political candidacies for objectives that you approve of. And in the course of struggle for them, these people isolate themselves. Now it's a technical question, but a very important technical question. We took it in a narrow dogmatic way but the general policy of the Communists throughout the world in the late 20's was class against class. Precisely the German Communists made. They didn't distinguish between the forces behind Hitler and forces around the other parties. They didn't strive to increase wedges between the forces around Hitler and forces of the other parties. Whatever mistakes they made, were in the form of not fighting hard enough for the united front with the Social Democrats and with other democratic parties to not recognizing the threat of Hitlerism. The whole new concept of this society would give rise to complete abolition of capitalistic democracy. But they did distinguish between democracy and Fascism on one hand. On the other hand, they didn't distinguish between the forces behind Hitler. They underestimated the real nature of the conflict within the Capitalist class over the question of whether we shall continue with the traditional Democratic form or go into Fascism. That was an historic mistake. In that sort of environment the whole question of a lesser evil arose. The Social Democrats supported Hindenburg as a lesser evil to Hitler. And this is what we were always afraid of doing over here, in this country, similarly supporting someone who would bring a Hitler into this country.

seeing a brochure upstairs, of La Follette being on the front and it was

But we made errors in that respect. We had made errors to the approach to the La Follette movement--the Socialist in this day on a national scale if you could make mistakes. And these mistakes contributed to a division of people and insofar as I wouldn't say that they played a sizeable role but they were a contribution towards the rise of McCarthyism here, in a sense that they weren't able to . . . a big enough movement against this sort of thing, and the people were unprepared, they didn't even see what McCarthyism was going to mean before it arose. So the Chinese are making similar errors, they are not distinguishing between Kennedy, for instance, and Goldwater, they are not distinguishing between . . . that Kennedy has, which meant Kennedy himself. To them, it's American imperialism, and Kennedy is head of it. Therefore, Kennedy is the main enemy, and from this point of view they are making a very sad mistake that will probably result in divisions in their own organization which already resulted in disunity on an international scale. They'll get over it. They'll continue building Socialism and the unity in the world. The Communist movement will be sore, but the big question is how much damage is going to be done, how long is it going to take. That's the big problem. We can economize these errors, because we make them ourselves, many of the members are still making them.

DAVID: Let me ask you about one of those. You mentioned that you referred specifically to the La Follette movement, I remembered seeing a brochure upstairs, of La Follette being on the front and it was

about the reality of action. From what you said, I gather you wouldn't agree with that now.

MR. BLAIR: Absolutely not! I would not agree with that now. It was narrow thinking then, on my part, and I was playing a reasonable role in the organization, sort of in politics. You try to figure things out and there were many things in the La Follette stance, in the political stance, faced a couple directions, and of course, there was a distinction between La Follette and Bob which I personally didn't see until later, there was quite a bit of distinction between the two of them. Everybody, many people warned that there was a difference; you can't lump them together. Then we were confused by Phil's formation of this National Progressive Party, which was an organized type of party; we intended to lump Phil and Bob together and we also forgot that La Follette movement was more than the La Follettes themselves. It was all these people that stayed there. Now there were differences in our party in approach to La Follette, there were differences in approach in a period of course. A number of mistakes were made but I'm sure if we had the approaches we have now, but it was already too late in 1946 when La Follette went into the Republican party, already the handwriting was on the wall. When La Follette went into the Republican party then you had the voters recognize that the main avenue of the fight was going to be in the La Follette primary and it was necessary to recognize this, that of the two La Follette was the lesser evil, it was necessary to go in there and back him to beat they were potential misleaders, that their aim was to really get everybody

McCarthy, but instead we were tangled up in the conflict between La Follette and Roosevelt and, frankly speaking, our feeling was still a hangover from the war, the feeling was that Roosevelt had been correct and La Follette had been wrong in opposing Roosevelt. We didn't recognize that we had something here in the Progressive Party in the state in a different situation. The fact that La Follette won in the Republican Party made us concentrate all of our efforts on (we had been concentrating all our efforts on the Democratic Party) the Progressive Party. There's a prehistory to that too. It goes back to the earlier campaign of 1938 and that was where the split between La Follette and Roosevelt became rather sharp. At that time, the present Judge Duffy was running for U.S. Senator and he had a good record as a Senator before that, and La Follette ran Elkhorn as a Progressive against Duffy making it a three-way switch and that's how wide it got. That was the beginning. We exerted our influence to try to get the Progressives to withdraw at least they should combine, you know, behind one candidate to recognize that it all worked out when we get through that there will be a three-way split. Well, we didn't succeed and that increased the hard feelings, there were bad feelings all along. Then, of course, as we've gone back before, they were distrustful of us, dating back to '24, the differences we had under the La Follette movement then, but through this whole period, there was an element on our part on distrust, a feeling that these people were potential traitors, that they were potential misleaders, that their aim was to really get everybody

back into the Republican Party and behind Big Business and so on. In politics, a person has no business trying to psychoanalyze people or look behind them, you got to take things as they come and as they stand. As I say, it was too late already when La Follette went back to the Republican party instead of the Democratic party, but I don't know whether it would have made a difference if we could have, if we'd had our present approach back then or not. It might have given that little tip; I don't know how we would have prevented Harry Stassen (Harold Stassen). He's the fellow who really beat La Follette; he had over 30,000 votes in the Republican primary, and La Follette lost with 5,000. If Harry Stassen had been out of that picture, it might have been different. La Follette might have won, and then our tactic wouldn't have been to support McMurray in the finals. That's proof that it didn't make much difference to the Republican problem like the one where the real candidate was anyway. McCarthy beat La Follette, and McMurray didn't even get a shadow in the finals. But we threw our support behind McMurray even though we didn't want to, so I have a feeling our attitude toward the Socialists in Milwaukee is one only luke warm. We tried to cooperate, but when we met with rebuffs, we didn't find any way of overcoming them. If we didn't have that cock-eyed approach that they are the most dangerous ones because they mislead, it would have been different. The labor movement would have been somewhat

different too and , of course, we were the first to get these down in defeat; no, we weren't really the first, the Socialist Party, without ourselves having a policy of unity of everybody on the left; they inherited the bad feelings of the split of 1919 and know the antagonisms and have seen Burger and Tillson on one side and Ruthenberg and John Reed and the others on the other side. It was a very bitter fight. And that antagonism stayed on. Well, they had the distrust of the Communists and the fear. So we met with rebuffs from them; they themselves didn't have a unity approach, and without having one ourselves, how could we really begin to overcome it. To make certain headway in '35, '36, and 1937. And they were working about up till '38. We were working fairly close in many cases. We worked with Lions and the CIO people like this; there was the Socialists Donocan. There were a whole number of people that favored cooperating with us. Well, as it turns out, that cracked up, that broke up when the War began and this cooperation turned into like a cooperation and another thing that happened is that the Socialists kept losing to Franklin, the Progressive Party and then into the Democratic party. So they were both suckers, and we have to bear our responsibilities and they have to bear their responsibilities. Now is the problem at this late stage in history to having what we'd consider a correct approach would be able to find a way to build this unity on the left. The old left is pretty weak, but the new left sure isn't. Yet the new one carries many

hangovers from the old one.

DAVID: What do you see this left to be made out of?

MR. BLAIR: The New left, the rising of the country, is made up of fools, many of them don't even deal with socialism. But I say certainly these advanced categories in the Negro separation movement. A group of people among the youths, people who are seeking for more basic fundamentals than they can find in their Republican or Democratic party. These are people who are acting in what you might call a left direction, that is they are pushing for more fundamental solutions, for reforms in legislation and government, they are pushing for different types of action. They succeeded among the Negro people for making it accepted, for demonstrations, sit-ins, all these forms of action which Kennedy fully approved of by saying it was an old American custom. But you can see that the labor movement so far it hasn't reached too far. It embraces the Communists, it embraces the people who are organized in among the Socialists. There are people in this left all these various groupings some of which don't want to organize or work with the others, like Socialist Labor Party, Socialists Workers Party, etc. There's a whole grouping in the church movement, too. Left-ward moving people, including among the Catholics too very sizeable--among the Jewish people it's a very enormous thing, this co-election, but its bound to be further developed. Bound to become more and more constantly anti-monopoly and that's where its necessary to be obvious.

liberals or stand for, La Follette, --- (the tape fails here.)

The conclusion of it can only be a merging of all kinds of elements into a collision effort against monopoly and a very anti-monopoly government. They are getting majority in the house of Congress and the legislature and so on, where it can be influenced in measures against monopolies. In our opinion if that's the way the monopoly is moving, in our opinion this lays the basic ground-work for the next step, which is socialism. Now our conception today differs sharply from the America that we can achieve Socialism under our form of government. We don't need a reorganization of the government on the basis of factories and farms and military units. We believe we can achieve it through our present form of government under our constitution and that's what we're fighting for, that's what our aim is, our objective. In that period, our objective was a transformation of the very governmental structure. We don't say it won't happen, but that's not what we're fighting for, and I think we're realistic and we weren't realistic then. Even though that was a different time, people weren't afraid of the word revolution like they are now. They're getting so they're not afraid of it now but this is a revolution that is going on. It's a people's democratic revolution and the objective will be equality. In other words, it's a completion of the revolution that was unfinished by the Civil War.

DAVID: You mentioned that if these groups were to collect in a movement, they would eventually be a monopoly of this problem in all these areas. What would keep them from following the approach of the liberals or stand for, La Follette, --- (the tape fades here.)

MR. BLAIR: Well, I think, that our country is going to move in the direction of Socialism, to Socialism much more than you think because it will be the only way for the people to go. See what you have under motion at the present time is three big rivers that are moving among the people, the first, in the most dramatic form is the movement towards Negro equality. The second one is the whole movement of the people against automation. And the third, is the whole movement for peace, which is the fate of all humanity. These things are under way. Neither of these three can meet their objective without coming smack up against a small group of monopolists who benefit from the things that call these people tougher. Negroes can't get equality that means anything, without getting jobs. They can't get jobs without having a peacetime economy. Which means they go bang up against Bowing, all these other outfits, Du Pont, and rest the profits from the keeping the cold war going. So they go bang up against monopolies similiarly on the fight against automation.

Those that have the largest accumulation of capital benefit the most. It's the mass people that suffer the most. Not only the blue collar workers (the production workers) but also white collar workers probably are going to suffer even more. Well, it becomes very obvious that automation is benefitting only the holders of very large capital, the extra profit comes through the elimination of labor. This in turn increases the whole suffering of unemployment

good step and let's move a little further. Now that difference is being

and decreases the market, teaches the sharpness, the absurdity of this system. So when the fight against automation is going up against monopolies also, similarly with the fight for peace, those that profit the most are the most concerned with keeping the order in their life. The difference between these people and Kennedy, Kennedy also was a monopoly, he represents big capital but he's a representative of the class as a whole. Doesn't see any reason to sacrifice the class or the system of society that they live under for the sake of the profits of affection. That's what leads to a conflict, and it's a very sharp conflict. If anyone thinks it isn't, all they have to do is try to change this federal tax allowance given to the oil company. You know what a crisis that leads to in Congress when anybody makes a move in that direction. So, and Kennedy has declared war on those people on two questions. The question of peace and the question of the problem of civil rights. That means he has a feeling for the people. Well, they're gonna have faith in Kennedy. But Kennedy can't keep their support unless he makes certain moves. Now here is again where our tactic was different years ago: When Kennedy makes a speech to incorporate things that we believe in, we take it at its face value and we say, let's do what he says. Then we'll say, oh, you're a faker you're a phony and so on. You can see, the Chinese say this is a Capitalist trick. They won't have nothing to do with it. They're looking behind it and speculating what's behind it and so on, we say this is a good step and let's move a little further. Now that difference is being

realistic and it becomes vitally important that the fate of humanity is at stake. After all, what's the purpose of the Communist party? It's only to fulfill an end. The end of a society without plaster. The end of a society where they don't need any stakes to keep other classes down. Its aim is really to abolish yourself. The basic censor of the Communist approach has to be a humanistic approach. It's not for the sake of power, it's power for the sake of achieving things, where it's necessary to have such power. That's the purpose. Keeping us all under Socialism, the class struggle would increase. If classes were being abolished, the class struggle would increase, hence, all this against the people, and so on. That rose out of the isolated position of the Soviet Union and out of its own personality. . .

It can't be the Chinese or the Germans under their own circumstances. They consider that it takes years before it is decided whether Socialism wins, or Capitalism. They consider that the state has to be held onto all these years, we disagree. They consider that the building of Socialism is a matter of generation and that was the difference we had with the American Socialists years ago. They consider that it will take a long, long time. It's exactly the difference the Negroes had with the graduates and the . . . So you have this confusing thing in politics. Covered up by a very radical approach. We don't always recognize it in society. We learn from our errors. Now our society as a whole hasn't really faced up yet to complete examination for that period. But I can see in what is more fundamental than any words

to you, I can see my own approaches. Every once in a while something of that attitude pops up, course, our word is only verbalization of our opposition of it anyway. They fire very early. That was a very dramatic period and the impressions will stay on us older people. The younger ones come with new impressions, and they speak the newer ideas. Our job is to try to help them avoid those errors. I've often wished that I'd get a chance to talk to Ed about this period, over here. There were certain times but it would be impossible because even though we've never met, all anyone ever has to do is mention my name and he blows his stack. Because of a couple incidents in the past, but there were times when we differed and he was right, and we were wrong. And of course, there were times when he was wrong and we were right. But if we could have a discussion we might iron out some of these things, we might say well now, maybe we can sort of compromise by representing a whole turn following the liberals. As far as his attitude toward the party is concerned.(?)

La Follette was running against some of his opponents here. He didn't raise issues of sharp attack alone. We had concentrated our attacks upon the candidate we considered most reactionary. Before we differed with him, we presented our own point of view and let them make there own judgement.

DAVID: I was going to ask you, you've been referring to the difference between the Soviet party and the Chinese party.

MR. BLAIR: Well, I don't get quite what it is, I know that with

the idea that the Socialists workers party has had for a couple years, there's going to be armed conflict. There are indications of the things. This notion, for instance, that the Chinese party puts forward, we can't have Communism in one country. The whole world has to be Communists. It's just a up-to-date version of the ideas that Stratsky split with the party, back in 1927. But that's neither here nor there; in my opinion these things may get worse before they get better, but there's gonna be all kinds of disagreement and the thing may be very sharp but I cannot see the Chinese going back to the system they had before. I don't think that's the aim of the leaders of the Chinese movement. I don't think that it will get as even a reach of the sharpness that it did under Stalin. I don't understand many things in the Soviet approach to the party. But I do know as far as our American party is supposed to have been concerned, here's something that will lead into the recording here, it's very short but it's something that we drew up last night. What we consider is our approach to the United States and I'm gonna forward it to the National Committee of the Communist party and work and so on. This is in essence the way we look at it. American Communists are extremely critical of the Chinese Commies and the fight of the war to end peace. But this disagreement with the Chinese Communists should not at all interfere with the campaign for correct American government policy, least of these, China. The State Department policies have not recognized the largest country,

different approach. He would be forced into it. It can't be calling Kennedy the enemy of the people. I don't know if that answers-

of Russian-Chinese into the United Nations. All these policies are as wrong as they ever were. And require our opposition which should not let up just because we feel that Chinese Communist leadership is much inferior to theirs. In fact, if I could reverse the American policy, in relation to Chinese itself, part of the fight for peace for co-existence and the change of American policy might very well remove one of the factors that contribute to the isolation of China and the results can affect this as on our policy. This is a result of pressuring it out over a number of hours, from different people, discussion, and so on, and finally to rule this thing out. That's our approach. We disagree with the Chinese as far as their approach to world peace, approaches to Stalinism and Socialism and we certainly defend the American parties approach to getting Socialism into this country. We certainly have no intention of following the Chinese party or anybody else when it comes to American politics. If we follow the advise of the Chinese party, for instance, in the attitude toward Negro relations, or going to the working people and saying: Kennedy, he's the enemy. Where would everyone be? It would be foolish, it'd be absurd. That's precisely what the Socialist party is doing, and what we think is wrong. So the problem is to bring these pressures like in this form for instance the pressure is mainly ideological, but it wouldn't be ideological to change the policies of our government. It would be wiser to correct the Chinese party now. The Kennedy administration might do what Kennedy wants to in a different approach. He would be forced into it. It can't be calling Kennedy the enemy of the people. I don't know if that answers-

DAVID: No, that does. Why don't you revert back for a while. You're from Wisconsin? What county?

MR. BLAIR: Yes, Sharon County. Well, I was born in Berlin, that's in Green Lake County, right on the edge.

DAVID: The other La Follette was quite popular then?

MR. BLAIR: Yeah, that's right and the time I was growing up. To tell you frankly, I was from a family that was divided. The older brothers favored him and my father was a very complete opposite. He backed him not at all. He had no use for La Follette. Of course, we were very patriotic during the First World War. La Follette was in Fond du Lac where we lived at that time or in our home town. We didn't see anything wrong with that. We were full German. When my older brother died, we became, well, we had never been enthusiastic about war. When my older brother died in the flu epidemic while he was in the army, that had led to considerable amount of re-thinking. But we were mainly Republican up till 1928. My father and mother began to quit in around about 1932. But I began to change my approach already around in the late '20's. I went to school here at Madison. I took part in the '28th campaign, ran the whole scale, I knew I wasn't a Communist then, I didn't become that until I left in 1929. That was the history, you see, this state was so divided. In the working class, there were many fist fights always between those that were for La Follette or against him. The Socialist movement was broken up by hoodlums throwing dead cats and all kinds of stuff at him. Always beating people up,

it was quite a battle. They took the policies very seriously. Of course, once you got out of the state, there wasn't any of that. La Follette Republican or regular Republican meant the same thing.

DAVID: How did you feel, you said your older brother felt one way and your father. .

MR. BLAIR: Well, in those days, I was too young, then, I remember a 1912 election, arguing between us back and forth. My dad liked Roosevelt, but he was mad because he didn't belong to no party. La Follette had no use here. The people weren't with him at all. As time went on, they started to, they became more radical, they supported La Follette, they entered to move in that direction. It took a long time because most of our families were against the plan in 1924. To state very briefly and then went out. You hear political education, many young people are going through that now. Who knows where they're gonna wind up. Once they leave them, they'll never go back. If they are supposed to be in something-

DAVID: Well, I noticed then in Look magazine it said that the people who are going to the Birch Society are people who yearn to the old excitement of politics when we threaten and two parties are dull, you agree with the Birch idea?

MR. BLAIR: There's a lot of people who's on there. They could as well be in something else. You gotta distinguish between La Follette. People didn't see who was really running the show. They didn't see what was really going on. They don't see who's really

behind the Birch society. The money was their objective, take, for instance, a local Bircher, they're tied up nationally with anti-Negro. Yet Grady who runs the Grady Foundry here furnishes a lot of money for this stuff, Grady has influence in the radio station. He sees that they give Negro disc jockeys a chance, put themselves forward. He is putting some money down to set up a straw house down here where the Society on East Street. The same gang are the impulserators of the straw house that were in the town crier and before the town crier was the national action. Isabell Meyer is around there all the time and yet their feel is for the Negro, come in and play bongo drums, singing folk music and so on. They have a gang of homo sexuals. It seems to be another characteristic of the gang. So it's true that young people who are first to become politically interested may become affected by things like that. They see that red wing are picketing at their meeting, disturbing things going on. They pilfer a few bucks every time that they picket, they get dragged into it and maybe they get someone to give them a talking to and uses some missionary zeal saving the country, so the first thing you know they are incorporated into it and they don't really know what's going on but to judge a movement by that look, would be wrong. It's just like saying that Facism is holding the middle classes in Germany. True, the mass among the middle class among these classes of workers and employers but the classes and all that was and remains to be, the instrument and most of the instruments. We pretended that we opened the fair to dictatorship of that section, over the old 50,000

... is your ah--

...ing to the working